DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 911 HE 001 455

AUTHOR	Locklin, Ralph H.; Stewart, Clifford T.
TITLE	Student, Faculty, and Administrator Perceptions of Decision-Making at Four Colleges.
INSTITUTION	American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio.; Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Education Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes, *Attitudes, College Environment, *Decision Making, Faculty, *Governance, *Higher Education, Student College Relationship, Student Participation, Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

This study reports an attempt to look at differences between the views of students and "faculty-administration." The study also sought to determine whether each group was misunderstanding the amount of control desired by the other group. To investigate the problem, questionnaires containing questions about 38 campus issues were distributed to a sampling of students, faculty, and administrators at 4 different types of institutions in the West. Respondents were asked to indicate how decisions should be made regarding either policy formulation or rules and regulations in each of the areas. In addition, students and faculty-administrators reported their perceptions on the degree of control desired by each other. Responses indicated that the students wanted more control over decision making than faculty-administration found desirable. Misunderstandings of the desires of the other group complicated the situation and led to intensification of problems. There were many issues, especially those related to individual student behavior, in which dominant norms in student desires did not exist. Faculty-administration responses were varied on most items. (AF)

ED038911

Student, faculty, and administrator perceptions of decision-making at four colleges.

Ralph H. Locklin and Clifford T. Stewart, PhD,

Claremont Graduate School

This research was part of a larger project funded by Xerox and Kettering Foundations and carried out with the assistance of Dr. John J. Wittich and Dr. John Cowan of the College Student Personnel Institute in Claremont, California.

HE 001 455

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Student, faculty, and administrator perceptions of decision-making at four colleges.

Ralph H. Locklin and Clifford T. Stewart, Ph.D.,
Claremont Graduate School

There is ample evidence that college students are demanding a greater voice in college and university decision-making. Though perhaps only a small percentage of students are involved in active forms of protest, there is probably a much larger number of students that support the goals of the protest activities. Though students protesting the draft and the Viet Nam war have captured a large share of the national press, there has been increasing student pressure for more student control in matters related to their own social behavior. In these struggles they have often had the faculty as allies against the administration, but this alignment has been somewhat disturbed. Students have recently begun to express dissatisfaction with inflexible course requirements and irrelevant course content. In these latter areas, the faculty has been much less of an ally and more of an antagonist. Wilson and Gaff (1969) reported that faculty were generally willing to grant formal student power in the formulation of policies about the regulation of student social behavior. On academic matters, however, a majority did not favor granting students formal vote, although a sizable number were willing to allow students some form of informal influence in this area. Their research did not include a sampling of student opinion,

Read at American Education Research Association Annual Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 1970.

however, and a general student sentiment supporting more student influence was assumed.

We attempted to take a direct look at differences between students and faculty-administration on how each group thought decisions should be made on a number of issues. We also wanted to see whether or not each group was misperceiving the amount of control desired by the other group and thus contributing to a distorted view of the amount of disagreement.

Method

We sought to get at this problem by first compiling a list of short statements describing areas of campus life that have been the subject of recent controversy. The resultant questionnaire contained 38 items and covered the areas of campus protest reported by Peterson (1968). In addition, some of the items covered areas which, while not prominent nationally as campus issues, were suspected as being areas where some degree of disagreement might exist.

The four institutions used in the study were selected so as to represent a diversity of colleges and universities. They were all in the West and included a small (477 enrollment), private, liberal arts college for women (FEM), a recently founded, medium-sized, (2,253 enrollment), public university (NEW) which had its first classes in 1965, a medium sized (2,360 enrollment), private university (OLD), and a large public university (BIG). Both FEM college and OLD

university are residential in nature, while nearly two-thirds of the students commute at NEW university, and about three-fourths commute at ~~old~~ BIG university. The sample sizes were 71 at FEM, 272 at NEW, 286 at OLD, and 320 at BIG, and were generally representative of the total enrollment at each of the schools with respect to sex, academic major, class, fraternity or sorority membership, and place of residence. The one exception to this was that resident students were greatly overrepresented at BIG university. In fact, over 80% of the sample was resident students. Though this does not complicate the analysis, it will have to be considered in the interpretation of the results.

The sampling of faculty and administrators was judgmental and was designed to include a preponderance of individuals who might actually be central figures in one or more aspects of the governing of the institutions. The sample was thus not representative, but rather contained disproportionately large representation of administrators and senior faculty such as department heads or deans. These samples ranged in size from 11 at FEM, up to 27 at both OLD and BIG universities. There were 13 in the sample from NEW university. A more detailed description of these samples is contained in Appendix A.

In Spring 1968, each respondent reported on a questionnaire how he thought decisions should be made regarding either policy formulation or rules and regulations in each of the 38 areas listed. In addition, students reported the degree of control they thought

the faculty-administration wanted and similarly, the faculty-administration reported how much control they thought students wanted. Responses were points on an 11 point continuum ranging from total student control to decisions made entirely by faculty-administration considered as a single group. The mid-point of the continuum was defined as "joint decisions" by students and faculty-administration--equal representation, equal vote. In this report, we shall consider the distribution of responses on this continuum as the collective opinion or perception of students and faculty-administration.

From both of the measures above, the following variables were defined:

1. Extent of control desired over decisions in each of the 38 areas
   a. By students
   b. By faculty and administration together.
2. Perception of extent of control desired by other's over decisions in each of the same 38 areas.
   a. Student perception of faculty/administration position.
   b. Faculty-administration perception of the student's position.

Analysis

The Mann-Whitney test for two independent samples was used since the distribution of responses on many of the items made it

quite clear that the assumptions underlying the t test could not be met. The U test is a fairly powerful nonparametric technique and uses ranks to test for differences. The U statistic is used for small samples but differences are reported in Z scores for large samples. Though the test is designed for continuous data a correction for ties is possible (Siegel, 1956) and serves to increase the size of the Z scores by a small amount. If Z scores uncorrected for ties are used, a conservative test results. In our analysis, these uncorrected Z scores were used except in cases where the cross sample rank ties were very large.

Since the student sample sizes were so much larger than the faculty-administration samples, they were reduced in size to be no more than three times larger at FEM college and NEW university. The reduction was to no more than twice the faculty-administration sample size at OLD and BIG universities. In every case the reductions kept constant the proportional distribution of student responses, and further served to give a conservative estimate of differences.

The 38 areas were grouped according to assumed referent and are listed in this way in Table 1. The first category refers to conduct of individual students and includes such areas as "manners and dress of students," "dispensing birth control pills from the student health service," and "permission to live off-campus." Topics in the second category include "student activities budget,"

"policies concerning content of the student newspaper," and "public expression of unpopular viewpoints by campus organizations" and refer primarily to formally organized student group activities. In a similar manner, such areas as determination of the curriculum and course content and matters referring to the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty, are primarily associated with the academic side of campus governance and made up the third grouping.

The final category contains items dealing primarily with the mechanics of general college business administration. These deal with "admission of students," "organizations permitted to recruit on campus," and "speakers from off campus for campus-wide events," "determination of general college policy and goals," and "management of the book store."

The differences in desired control are reported in Table 1 and are all in terms of Z scores. Only differences larger than one standardized normal deviation were included although the direction of all differences is reported.

The same is true for Table 2 which reports the differences between the extent of control desired and the relevant perception of how much control was desired. The item numbers correspond to those in Table 1.

Results

Looking at Table 1A, we can see that the areas related to individual student behavior show a fairly consistent trend for both students and faculty-administration to want more control or influence than the other group thinks they should have. On all but one issue, there were significant differences at two or more of the four colleges. NEW university is conspicuous by the appearance of large disagreement on only the two issues dealing with use of LSD and pot.

On items referring to student manners and dress, morals on campus, coed use of dormitories, dormitory hours, and permission to live off campus, sizable minority of students at all four colleges were willing to grant equal or nearly equal voice to faculty-administration on these matters while a majority tended to want total or near total student control over these matters. Most of the faculty-administration favored equal voice but many wanted predominant control by faculty-administration. This was not true at NEW university, however, and probably reflects the resident versus commuter distinction in part. It will be remembered that though BIG university was also primarily a commuter school, our sample contained nearly all resident students.

Students on all campuses wanted complete control of off-campus behavior and though some among the faculty-administration

agreed, there were substantial numbers tending to prefer some joint control at FEM college and BIG university.

In the areas of alcohol in dorms, drugs, and pot a large number of students wanted to share decision making power while smaller numbers favored either total student control or total control by faculty-administration. Responses were actually tri-modal. The faculty-administration attitude on these issues was not so variable and tended to favor either equal voice or a more predominant role for faculty-administration. The differences between schools on these issues was one of the degree in the directions of these trends.

In summary, these items, representing areas that seem most central to the in loco parentis idea, are important in the sense that both groups differ fairly consistently in the extent of control over decision-making deemed appropriate. The differences do occur in the mid-range of the scale with great variability in responses indicating that unitary student norms on these areas are not present and further, that the faculty-administration at each college seems to be willing to grant considerable influence to students, though not enough in the eyes of many students.

In Table 2A the first and perhaps most obvious general trend in the errors in perception of the other group's position is in their direction. All but a few errors are in the direction of over estimating the amount of control desired by the other group.

These errors are significant most often for students at both OLD and BIG universities, while students at FEM were most accurate and those at NEW university were intermediate.

The faculty-administration perceptions of student's actual position was very accurate at FEM, somewhat less accurate at OLD and NEW universities, and most inaccurate at BIG university, but, in general, were considerably more accurate than student perceptions.

It is interesting to note that the faculty-administration at OLD underestimated student desire for control on issues relating to dormitory life and permission to live off campus. These errors, while not large enough to be significant were the only large errors in this direction.

Turning now to Table 1B, it can be seen that there is seemingly less disagreement on how decisions should be made in areas of organized student activities than in individual student behavior. Many students and faculty-administration favored equal voice, equal vote in most of these areas. A majority of students, however, wanted complete control or varying degrees of student domination in these areas. While a few faculty-administration would agree with that position, more preferred a slight degree of faculty-administration control. These differences were generally not large.

Turning to Table 2B, it is evident that errors in perception do not reflect the apparent low level of actual disagreement in this

area. The level of student overestimation of how much control faculty-administration wanted is as high or higher than on the previous issues. An analogous situation exists for faculty-administration perceptions of student actual position and, though their overestimates are less in comparison with students', their errors are consistently overestimates. FEM college had the lowest level of mutual misperception while BIG university had the highest level.

The faculty-administration seemed to have reacted mainly to the group of students who reported that they wanted total control. On the other hand, though a similar trend existed for student perceptions of faculty-administration position, a substantial number of students saw the faculty-administration as wanting a degree of control higher than the most extreme faculty-administrator response on control desired. Once again, this tendency is much less applicable to the situation at FEM college.

Turning now to the areas of academic affairs, we see in the Table 1C that the pattern across campuses is fairly consistent--all issues being significant at OLD and BIG university, with fewer large differences at FEM college and NEW university. Where this difference shows most clearly is on issue 8, functions of the student-faculty council. While the modal response for both faculty-administration and students was equal voice, equal vote, at both OLD and BIG universities, there were a number of students wanting to have student control of this body and similarly, a number among

the faculty-administration desiring to have control of the functions of the student-faculty council for themselves. This is a case where a fairly small proportion of both samples transformed an area seemingly demanding collaboration into an area of contention between the two groups. This did not occur to any great degree at FEM college and NEW university.

Students on all four campuses desired more influence in determining the content of courses, the curriculum, and the policy concerning purchase of library books. The modal student response on all three issues indicated a desire for equal voice--equal vote, with most of the balance of students preferring varying degrees of faculty-administration predominance.

Areas related to appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty were generally regarded by students on all campuses as the proper domain of faculty-administration though this was less true at OLD and BIG universities. The faculty-administration at all four campuses, however, regarded hiring, tenure, and promotion of faculty as areas for nearly complete faculty-administration control, although a number of individuals would give some influence to students.

Errors in perception produced some interesting contrasts in Table 2C. Again, mutual perceptions are most accurate at FEM college while on the other three campuses, both student and faculty-administration perceptions were inaccurate to about the same degree.

At BIG university, the errors were small. Errors were larger at NEW university and further illustrate how misperceptions seem to complicate issues. On matters of hiring, promotion, and tenure of faculty, both faculty-administration and students alike overestimated the degree of control desired by the other group--this occurred in spite of the fact that they seemed to differ little on how they thought control should be distributed.

It is also interesting to note that the faculty-administration at OLD university is essentially alone in underestimating the desired influence of students to a significant degree. This occurred in areas of determination of curriculum, course content, and library book purchasing policy.

In general, the areas of academic administration have norms more clearly defined for students and faculty-administration alike. It is also reflected in student norms essentially supporting faculty-administration control, but with a tendency to want more student control in areas of course content, curriculum, and library book purchasing policy.

Table 1D gives the disagreements in the areas of general college administration. Only "admission of students" stands out as an area of little disagreement. Both students and the faculty-administration desired student involvement but with faculty-administration predominance.

On the appointment of administrators and the salaries of the faculty and administrators, both students and faculty-administration agreed that the faculty-administration should have total or near total control. A sizable minority of students at both BIG and OLD universities wanted more student influence. The same was true in the areas of tuition and fees and college budget, though in these areas students tended to want a more nearly equal voice. A few students at OLD and BIG universities even wanted student control of these areas.

In the determination of general college policies and goals, type of new buildings to be constructed, campus planning, and selection of resident advisor, a large number of students at all four colleges seemed to want equal representation, equal vote, with a usually larger number willing to accept varying degrees of faculty-administration control. However, in general the faculty-administration tended to endorse greater degrees of control by them.

In the areas of organizations permitted to recruit on campus, hours of the library, speakers for college wide events, and management of both the bookstore and college union, a majority of students on all four campuses endorsed varying degrees of student control but with a large proportion preferring equal representation, equal vote. The faculty-administration at all four campuses also generally endorsed equal representation, equal vote in these areas, but with a smaller number preferring some degree

of faculty-administration control. Whether or not a particular issue had a significant difference was determined by the degree to which these trends held. Disagreement was generally lower at FEM college with NEW university characterized by general agreement on how decisions should be made.

In Table 2D we can see that each group again overestimates the control desired by the other group. Again FEM college had the lowest level of misperception, but mutual overestimates were largest on admission of students where they actually agreed on slight faculty-administration control. In general, the level of inaccuracy reflected in this table is lower than in the areas of individual student behavior or student group activities.

Summary and implications

Several caveats should be mentioned. First the faculty-administration samples were small. However, the results in the area of student social behavior as contrasted with academic affairs are generally in line with those reported by Wilson and Gaff (1969), so the small sample size shouldn't make us too uncomfortable.

The technique used cast the problem in a confrontation format, though it did allow us to see differences and errors of perception more clearly. We do recommend, however, that further studies use a non-zero-sum approach with different groups identified separately so as to allow the response of a high level of control or influence by all groups.

We can report the general findings that:

1. Students want more control over the decision making processes than the faculty-administration wants them to have in most areas.
2. Misperception of the desires of the other group complicate the situation often leading to pseudo disagreements or intensifying disagreements that might actually exist. In addition, perceptions of others' actual position were much less variable than when each group reported the amount of control desired indicating some perceptions were dictated by stereotypes.
3. There are many issues, particularly in some areas related to individual student behavior where dominant unitary norms in student desires do not exist. Faculty-administration responses were also quite variable on most items.

More specifically, we can report that in loco parentis is not an entirely dead issue, though according to student perceptions of faculty and administration desires, it is still a seemingly significant issue.

It is also interesting to note that at both the smallest school and in some areas at the newest school were characterized by a lower level of disagreement and more accurate perceptions. In the case of NEW university the fact that most students were commuters

certainly cannot be ignored. It would be interesting to speculate, though, whether newness is related to the ease or liklihood of instituting new procedures, or structures to permit greater student voice in policy making.

At FEM college, with a little over 400 students, we could reasonably assert that disagreements can be worked out easier and that the interaction is intense and complete enough to prevent gross misperceptions from developing. Does it also imply that perhaps a single formal and informal communication net involves nearly all members of the organization such that most information is shared readily on issues facing the college?

If we are willing to answer in the affirmative, then perhaps the single most important implication of the study is to recommend that greater attention and energy be devoted to improving intra-campus communication not only between students and faculty or administration, though this is certainly important, but perhaps equally important is student to student communication on campus issues.

The formal structure of the organization is certainly a relevant factor since structure undoubtedly affects communication although an argument can be made that who occupies organizational roles is more important (Hodgkinson, 1969). The model being developed by Likert and his co-workers (Likert, 1961; 1967) in an

industrial setting would seem to be very applicable to colleges and universities and indeed several plans have been proposed that contain some elements of this model (Elliot, 1969; Hodgkinson, 1969; The Temple Plan. . ., 1968). The model involves an overlapping group structure that still makes possible central administrative coordination while intensifying the interaction-influence system. The research results involving tests of this model in industry have been impressive (Likert, 1967).

Quite aside from broad structural changes, which might prove difficult indeed, are the steps that can be taken to insure broader, more intense communication through informal structures. For instance, greater sharing of information without extensive change in formal structure seemed to result in higher satisfactions for the faculty at North Carolina (Demareth et al, 1967). Laboratory studies (Bavelas, 1968) also seem to indicate higher participant satisfaction when there is a greater sharing of information with decisions made in an interaction process.

What is most appropriate then, could be broad formal structural changes but what may be most necessary is changes in the informal structure that permit not only greater student access to and communication with faculty and administration, but also allows a greater integration of the general student body into a more comprehensive campus communication net.

References

Bavelas, A. Communication patterns in task-oriented groups. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.) Group dynamics. New York: Harper & Rowe, 1968.

Demerath, N. J. Stephens, R. W. and Taylor, R. R. Power, presidents and professors. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Elliot, L. H. Changing internal structures. In Caffrey, J. (Ed.) The future academic community. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Hodgkinson, H. L. Who decides who decides? In Smith, G. K. (Ed.) Agony and promise. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Likert, R. The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967

Likert, Rensis. New patterns in management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Peterson, Richard E. The scope of organized student protest in 1967-1968. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric methods for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

The Temple plan for university governance. Report of the Commission on Student Participation in the Policy-Making Processes of the University, Temple University, September, 1968.

Wilson, R. G. and Gaff, J. G. Student voice-Faculty response. Research Reporter. University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1969.

Appendix A

Faculty-administration sample description

BIG University	13	"Administrative officers"
	4	Vice presidents
	5	Tenured faculty in leadership positions
	5	Untenured, young faculty
	27	
OLD University	6	Student personnel deans
	6	Academic deans
	1	President
	3	Vice presidents
	5	Full professors either department heads or in leadership positions
	6	Untenured faculty, recent appointees
	27	

The faculty members represented 9 different departments.

NEW University	1	Chancellor
	2	Vice chancellors
	4	Administrative officers including student personnel deans
	4	Tenured faculty members in leadership positions
	4	Untenured faculty
	15	

All faculty were from the History department.

FEM College	1	Dean of students
	2	Assistant deans of students
	4	Tenured faculty members in leadership positions
	4	Untenured faculty members
	11	

TABLE 1

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CONTROL DESIRED BY FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL DESIRED BY STUDENTS

		FEM	NEW	OLD	BIG
A.	INDIVIDUAL STUDENT BEHAVIOR				
1.	Manners and dress of students	-1.94(1)	+(2)	-1.98*	-1.96*
2.	Student morals on campus	-2.58**(4)	-	-2.69**	-3.49**
3.	Student morals off campus	-2.48*(3)	-	-1.53	-2.88**
4.	Dispensing birth control pills from the student health service	-3.20**	-1.80	-2.36*	-3.49**
6.	Use of LSD and other psychedelic drugs	-1.80	-2.08*	-1.76	-1.71
7.	Use of marijuana	-2.39*	-2.60**	-1.59	-1.88
29.	Use of liquor in dormitories	-1.68		-3.43**	-3.15**
30.	Coed use of dorms	-2.28*	-	-3.55**	-3.30**
31.	Dorm hours	-2.09*	-	-2.59**	-3.31**
32.	Permission to live off campus	-2.95**	-	-3.87**	-4.54**
B.	STUDENT GROUP ACTIVITIES				
5.	Student activities budget	-1.16	+1.24	+	-1.03
9.	Minimum GPA for participation in activities	-1.47	+	-2.15*	-1.68
10.	Policies concerning running the student newspaper	-1.57	+	-2.29*	-2.63**
11.	Policies concerning content of student newspaper	-	+	-1.36	-2.39*
34.	Speakers from off campus for on campus clubs	-	+	-	-1.23
35.	Off campus projects of student organizations	-	-1.23	-	-
36.	Public expression of "unpopular" viewpoints by campus organizations	+	+	-	-2.37*
C.	ADMINISTRATION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS				
8.	Functions of the student faculty council	-	-1.00t(5)	-2.89**t	-2.43*t
14.	Determination of course content	-3.12**	-1.95*	-4.73**	-3.21**
15.	Determination of curriculum	-2.86**	-1.36	-4.50**	-4.39**
19.	Appointment of faculty	-	-	-2.49*	-2.87**
21.	Promotion and tenure of faculty	-	-	-2.57**	-2.91**
25.	Policy concerning purchasing library books	-2.34*	-1.24	-3.87**	-3.89**

D.	ADMINISTRATION OF NONACADEMIC AFFAIRS				
12.	Organizations permitted to recruit on campus	-2.08*	-1.06	-3.18**	-3.59**
13.	Admission of students	+	+	-1.01	-1.87
16.	Determination of general college policy and goals	-3.90**	-1.19	-4.12**	-3.34**
17.	Appointment of administrators	-	-	-1.95	-2.39*
18.	Administrative salaries	+	+	-2.28*	-2.20*
20.	Faculty salaries	+	+	-2.01*	-1.97*
22.	Tuition and fees	-1.56	-1.02	-4.75**	-3.45**
23.	College budget	-1.57	+	-5.42**	-3.63**
24.	Hours library is open	-3.33**	-1.83	-4.58**	-3.20**
26.	Type of new buildings to be constructed	-2.67**	-1.37	-2.69**	-1.82
27.	Campus planning	-2.95**	+	-2.86**	-2.93**
28.	Selection of resident advisor	-1.89	+1.04	-3.30**	-1.76
33.	Speakers from off campus for college wide events	-1.33	+	-3.83**	-2.62**
37.	Management of book store	-2.48*	-	-3.82**	-2.49*
38.	Management of college union	-1.61	-	-3.24**	-2.70**

Notes:

1. All scores are in terms of normalized standard deviations (Z). The signs of all differences are reported, but only the amounts are reported for differences greater than 1.00.

2. Negative scores mean that each group wanted more control than the other group thought they should have.

3. * Significant beyond .05, two tailed test.

4. ** Significant beyond .01, two tailed test.

5. "t" indicates that the correction for cross-sample rank ties was used.

Table 2

Errors in Student Perceptions of Faculty/Administration Actual Position (SpFA)

And Errors in Faculty/Administration Perceptions of Students Actual Position (FApS)

A. INDIVIDUAL STUDENT	FEM		NEW		OLD		BIG	
BEHAVIOR	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS
1	+1.15 (1)	+	+1.79	+1.63	+3.00**	+1.40	+2.97**	+1.98*
2	-	+	+2.32*	+	+2.62**	+	+3.86**	+2.44*
3	-	-	+1.29	-	+2.98**	-	+2.13*	+
4	+	-	+	+2.21*	+2.47*	+	+1.69	+2.64**
6	+1.08 (2)	+	+1.05	-	+2.41*	+1.24	+2.11*	+2.71**
7	+1.26	-	+		+2.71**	+	+2.03*	+2.74**
29	+1.58	+	+3.37**	+2.48*	+2.37*	-1.00	+2.62**	+1.67
30	+1.77	-	+2.65**	+2.03*	+2.21*	-	+4.51**	+
31	+1.97*(3)	-	+2.63**	+1.29	+3.17**	-1.63	+5.11**	+1.41
32	+2.83**(4)	-	+	+	+3.86**	-1.37	+2.88**	-
B. STUDENT GROUP ACTIVITIES								
5	+	+1.59	+3.44**	+2.77**	+3.82**	+1.84	+2.89**	+4.22**
9	+1.08	+1.08	+1.80	+1.93	+1.63	+	+1.91	+1.27
10	+1.26	+2.33*	+2.67**	+2.83**	+2.87**	+	+2.63**	+2.26*
11	+3.02**	+1.74	+3.32**	+1.39	+4.07**	+	+3.37**	+2.21*
34	+	+	+3.24**	+1.53	+3.23**	+	+3.47**	+1.13
35	+	+	+3.46**	+1.05	+3.34**	-	+4.43**	+1.59
36	+3.12**	+	+3.12**	+	+4.04**	+	+3.60**	-
C. ADMINISTRATION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS								
8	+	+	+1.23	+	+	-	+1.19	+1.04
14	-	-	+	+1.21	+	-2.61**	+1.15	+
15	+	+1.09	+1.24	+	+1.44	-2.04*	-	-
19	+	+	+1.96*	+2.88*	+2.10*	-	-	+1.38
21	-	+	+2.68**	+2.35*	+2.37*	-	+	+
25	-	+	+1.73	+	+	-2.26*	+	-

Table 2 (Continued)

D. ADMINISTRATION OF NON-ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

	FEM		NEW		OLD		BIG	
	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS	SpFA	FApS
12	+1.16	+1.14	+1.72	+2.03*	+	-	+	+
13	+2.60**	+2.24*	+1.52	+3.21**	+1.85	+2.07*	+	+2.45*
16	-	-	+1.27	+1.22	+1.08	-1.70	+1.84	-
17	+	+1.35	+1.55	+2.46*	+2.10*	+	+	+1.49
18	+1.03	+1.40	+	+2.16*	+	-	-	+1.46
20	+	+	+1.20	+3.12**	+	+	-	+1.64
22	+1.61	+	+2.25					
23	+	-	+2.86**	+1.31	-1.01	-3.13**	-1.25	+
24	+1.97*	-1.62	+2.03*	+	+2.43*	-3.08**	+2.91**	-1.47
26	+1.22	-	+3.98**	+2.54*	+2.89**	-	+2.26*	+1.82
27	+1.02	-1.06	+3.73**	+1.19	+2.31*	-	+2.12*	+
28	+1.46	+	+3.75**	+2.04*	+2.51*	-1.17	+2.46*	+
33	+1.87	+	+3.05**	+	+1.40	-2.97**	+2.41*	+
37	-1.28	-	+2.53*	-	+	-1.85	+	+2.00*
38	-	+	+2.26*	-	+1.53	-2.70**	+1.13	+2.02*

NOTES: (1) Scores are in terms of standardized, normal deviations (z)

(2) A positive score indicates an overestimate of control desired and a negative score indicates an underestimate of control desired.

(3) * Significant beyond .05 two tailed test.

(4) ** Significant beyond .01 two tailed test.

RHL:vwj
2-20-70

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

8-17-70